



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/704,558

11/03/2000

Yasuhito Taira

001475

4557

38834 7590 01/12/2005

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP
1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW
SUITE 700
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

BLACKWELL, JAMES H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 01/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/704,558

Applicant(s)

TAIRA, YASUHIRO

Examiner

James H Blackwell

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the corresponding address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 July 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 November 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to Amendment submitted 07/22/04.

The rejection of Claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. 112 2nd paragraph as indefinite has been withdrawn by the examiner.

Specification

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Drawings

Figures 1 and 3 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.121(d)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DuFresne (U.S. Patent No. 5,835,712).

In regard to independent Claim 1, DuFresne teaches in Fig. 6 a HTTP server (63) *(a processor)* connected via a network to a web client (61) *(note browser plus computer)* *(connected via a network system to an operation terminal unit containing a web browser)* that receives HTML pages from the server; the page, containing a web form (62), gets displayed on the web client (61) which allows for inputs *(inputs are made through a Web browser)*. The HTTP server machine consists of a HTTP server (63) *(web server division)*. When user inputs are collected on a Web form page, the browser forwards the input values to a Web server specified by the form. Upon receiving the form, the server (processor) starts a program to process the information transmitted. Such programs are known as the "common gateway interface" programs, or the "CGI scripts" *(a CGI script control division and a processing program division having a processing program)* (Col. 7, lines 59-62). DuFresne also teaches that each service request by the client (61) invokes a template (62) containing both static HTML and executable codes in an input field *(a display control file describing therein display control information for a Web page that is displayed on said operation terminal unit)* (Col. 9, lines 26-28). Additionally, each template in a preferred form provides identification and access control fields to identify and secure itself. The template (62) also includes "scripts" to perform various functions. The template is processed by the processor (63a) and each code is replaced by a stored data value or executed to perform certain task *(said CGI script division analyzes the description of said display*

control file which is designated by said Web browser, executes for processing said processing program following said description of said display control file) (Col. 9, lines 31-33). DuFrense does not specifically teach how the templates are processed by the processor, though some steering away from certain aspects of the standard CGI process are mentioned. However, the function of the processor as described by DuFrense describes a CGI-like functionality as far as the processor processing the html form elements is concerned. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to conclude that the processor does process the templates in a manner consistent with a CGI process, avoiding some pitfalls of the well known CGI process. DuFrense also teaches that this process produces an output HTML page (66), which is displayable on the client browser (*outputs display control information in said display control file to said Web browser based on the result of said processing*) (Col. 9, lines 34-35).

In regard to dependent Claim 2, DuFrense teaches that a template is a hypertext form, which includes a text area for entering source text such that the source can be edited and updated by accessing the template through any browser. Alternatively, the source can be inserted into a template through an electronic mail transfer. Each template further includes input fields for entering access control lists for specifying authorized users to read, write or execute the source in the template. Each template also includes an identification field for entering the template name (*file control division*). In a preferred embodiment, the templates are stored in a template database. The field names and corresponding contents of a template are stored in a content database. The

server of the present invention controls both the template and content databases.

Preferably, sources to all Web pages controlled by the processor of the present invention are constructed using templates. As previously mentioned, a source contains HTML tags and tag extensions of the present invention (*HTML division*). The extensions are directed to field names and corresponding field values. These values can be static but more often, they are variables, such as instructions, other tag extensions, URL's, or scripts. The values further can point to other templates (Col. 3, lines 60-67; Col. 4, lines 1-16).

In regard to dependent Claim 3, DuFresne teaches that each service request by the client (61) invokes a template (62) containing both static HTML and executable codes in an input field (Col. 9, lines 26-28). Additionally, each template in a preferred form provides identification and access control fields to identify and secure itself. The template (62) also includes "scripts" to perform various functions. The template is processed by the processor (63a) and each code is replaced by a stored data value or executed to perform certain task (*said CGI script control division reads said display control information for each line and executes an analyzing process*) (Col. 9, lines 31-33).

In regard to dependent Claim 4, DuFrense teaches that a template is retrieved for processing by the processor when a client makes a request for the corresponding displayable page. The source code defined within the template is then processed by the processor. Such process includes executing the tag extensions in the source to replace each extension with the corresponding value so as to configure the page with the

Art Unit: 2176

remaining hypertext codes. The resulting source to the displayable page is, therefore, a pure HTML document, which can be interpreted by the client browser (Col. 4, lines 30-39; compare with Claim 4, “... **said CGI script control division embeds in HTML output dynamic information related to the display of said Web page following the description in said HTML division and outputs the HTML output to said Web server division**”).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to Claims 1-4 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James H Blackwell whose telephone number is 571-272-4089. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on 571-272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James H. Blackwell
01/08/05



JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER